DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 404 210 SO 024 405

AUTHOR	Connell, Helen
TITLE	Education and Tolerance. International Commission on Education for the Twenty-First Century.
INSTITUTION	International Commission on Education for the Twenty-First Century (UNESCO), Paris (France).
REPORT NO	EDC/S/4
PUB DATE	May 94
NOTE	22p.; For related papers, see SO 024 394-407 and SO 024 448-454.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Education; Curriculum Development; Elementary Secondary Education; *Ethical Instruction; Foreign Countries; Global Approach; *Majority Attitudes; Minority Groups; Social Bias; Social Discrimination; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS	International Year of Tolerance; *Tolerance

ABSTRACT

This paper explores the issue of tolerance and its important place in education. The consequences of an unchecked growth of intolerance, fostered by indifference, in the form of an increase in violent conflict, promises to be not only unpleasant locally, but possibly catastrophic on a world scale, when interdependent social and economic structures and environmental consequences are taken into account. Focusing on education for tolerance is one way to achieve the goal of a tolerant world order. This paper refers to tolerance in a "strong" or clear and active sense, in contrast to the imprecise and ambivalent "weak" colloquial use of tolerance effectively as an apology for indifference. In an actively reciprocal tolerant order, it is not easy in practice to know where to draw the line between the acceptable and the unacceptable. Tolerance means acceptance of difference, yet there are limits to tolerance itself. This paper identifies three key educational challenges to learning and teaching tolerance: (1) defining the educational task; (2) establishing a knowledge base for educating for tolerance; and (3) overcoming identifiable obstacles and barriers that exist to the learning and teaching of tolerance. The paper identifies educational responses including system-wide school policies concerning tolerance, pre-school and early childhood learning, school level policies, organization, and management, curriculum-wide approaches, specific courses of study, and other areas of school and community life. Other possibilities discussed are adult and continuing nonformal education, monitoring and assessing education for tolerance, and supporting teachers. Policy implications are discussed. Contains 26 references. (DK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

EDC/S/4
MAY 1994

ED 404 210

Commission internationale sur l'éducation pour le vingt et unième siècle

International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century

EDUCATION AND TOLERANCE

BY

HELEN CONNELL

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

F ZANUTTINI

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

SO 024 405

UNESCO, Paris

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

● **Président/*Chairman***: Jacques DELORS ● **Membres/*Members***: Isao AMAGI, Roberto CARNEIRO, Fay CHUNG, Bronislaw GEREMEK, William GORHAM, Aleksandra KORNHAUSER, Michael MANLEY, In'am MUFTI, Marisela PADRÓN Quero, Marie-Angélique SAVANÉ, Karan SINGH, Rodolfo STAVENHAGEN, Myong Won SUHR, ZHOU Nanzhao

May 1994

International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century

Education and Tolerance

by

Helen M. Connell

1. Why is tolerance an issue?

1995 has been designated by the United Nations as International Year of Tolerance. Why should the world's attention be so sharply focused on such a seemingly benign, "worthy" and unspectacular a goal as "tolerance"? Is it perhaps that the issues it brings in train are more problematic, the challenges more profound, than might at first be thought?

Consider the continued prevalence of both intolerance and of indifference - both in their ways, the opposites of tolerance - embedded in social structures and exhibited in day to day behaviours in many and varied settings worldwide. The consequences of an unchecked growth of intolerance, fostered by indifference, in the form of an increase in violent conflict, promises to be not only unpleasant locally, but possibly catastrophic on a world scale, when interdependent social and economic structures and environmental consequences are taken into account.

To identify as a goal a tolerant world order, and to seek to achieve it in the face of these challenges, then, is by no means simple, straightforward, or uncontroversial. A focus on education for tolerance is not the whole answer, but must be seen as one of the ways forward.

2. What kind of issue is tolerance?

The question of how to accommodate differences within a peaceable and fair society is not new and raises fundamental issues about human nature and the ability of human groups to construct social harmony. History is perhaps a poor guide, at least if we consider history as a story of conflict and intolerance. Yet these episodes and events when people have been violently pitted against each other have also been one of the well springs of ideas and ideals directed at peace and harmony.

There is a long tradition in all major world cultures of approaches to accommodating differences peaceably (Morsy, 1993). Within the European culture realm, the bitter religious conflicts of the seventeenth century spurred Locke to write his seminal "Letter Concerning Toleration" in which he argued for the separation of state and church guaranteeing the right to religious freedom of all its citizens (Locke, 1948). From this initial concern with a universal value, i.e. religious freedom for all, the modern concept of tolerance has broadened further to embrace many aspects of difference in belief and

behaviour between individuals and groups. That very broadening, however, prompts questions about the limits to freedom and tolerance.

The modern concept of tolerance is grounded in the optimistic belief that through our own actions we can help improve the conditions of life on this planet. Although of ancient origins, this belief was powerfully reinforced by the philosophy of the Enlightenment (Passmore, 1970). By establishing a basis for peaceable and constructive interactions between people of different backgrounds and who hold different beliefs, we can, on this view, move towards the goal of a peaceful international community as envisioned by Comenius and others, and now enshrined in the UN Declaration of Human Rights. A complementary dimension is illustrated in the actions of Gandhi, who directed his approach of *satyagraha*, or non-violent civil disobedience, at what he believed was not to be tolerated - oppression and the denial of basic human rights (Gandhi, 1956). It is important in all discussion of tolerance, especially in educational settings, to develop an awareness of the complexity of the issues and the need to reconcile tolerance with other values. The study of history is of considerable importance since, properly handled, it can draw students into an awareness of both the complexity of values - and of action - and it can alert them to the consequences of ideas and outcomes which deny basic human rights to others.

What is the nature of a tolerant order? It is precisely because differences between individuals and groups - for example in the opportunity to achieve a fair and reasonable standard of living, in belief systems, in customs and in ways of life - give rise to rivalries, destructive competition and other tensions, that a means other than open conflict and domination by force needs to be sought if we are to achieve social cohesion and peace amongst diverse peoples on our globe. But a tolerant order is one in which, providing certain fundamental laws of social order and human rights are kept, citizens have the freedom without interference from others, to follow those beliefs and practices which they choose, be they to do with religious faith, political creed, ethical choice, social and cultural values or interpersonal relations. Mutual respect (though not necessarily liking) is the essential basis of such an order. That it is not always easy for people, at a personal level, to accord others that freedom, is aptly recognized by Bernard Williams in his characterization of tolerance as "an awkward virtue" (Williams, 1992). There is an inbuilt element of reciprocal tension in the concept - one often needs to make a conscious effort (in the interest of the greater good of social harmony) to accept that others may quite legitimately choose beliefs and behaviours not to one's own personal liking - while also recognizing that others may regard with distaste one's own beliefs and behaviours. This inherent tension, vexation or "suffering" (Yovel, 1993) can be uncomfortable.

The discussion in this paper refers to tolerance in its "strong", clear and active sense, to use Droit's distinction (1993), by contrast to the imprecise and ambivalent "weak" colloquial use of tolerance effectively as an apology for indifference. In an actively reciprocal tolerant order, it is not easy in practice to know where to draw the line between the acceptable and the unacceptable. There is of course a paradox to resolve: tolerance means acceptance of difference; yet there are limits to tolerance itself, as there are to freedom, if fairness, justice and harmony are to prevail. Can we tolerate the intolerable; can we accept the self definition by extremist groups and individuals of their "right" to proclaim doctrines and pursue actions which are damaging to society and destructive of the freedom of others? As J.S. Mill pointed out, the liberty of the individual must recognize the rights of others to certain qualities of life. Such issues are precisely what education for tolerance must focus on if it is to be anything other than a weak and flabby form of moral training.

Tolerance is not uni-dimensional; it does not entail the uncritical acceptance of whatever is or is done. Far from it, since a tolerant society cannot be unregulated, laissez-faire or anarchic. It must have the appropriate capacity to defend itself from erosion by those who may wish themselves to be tolerated, but who wish to deny that right to others. In establishing the limits of tolerance in particular settings, and enabling the construction and defence of tolerant societies, stand two of the greatest challenges to the practice of tolerance in our contemporary world. Education cannot be expected, alone, to define or set the limits to tolerance or even to carry the full burden of educating for tolerance once those definitions have been clarified and the boundaries set. Tolerance and intolerance are deeply embedded in the social fabric and belief systems of all countries. Education must play its part but must not be left with the full responsibility: the family, the work place, the community must all be brought into partnership with the school in determining policies, implementing them and considering their effects in action.

Despite the complex, problematic nature of the concept of tolerance and the unresolved philosophical debate, we can recognize within the education world a widespread consensus in favour of tolerance as a universal, if still unclear, value to be addressed and encouraged at all levels of educational activity. The educational interest may be broadly characterized as recognizing that tolerance is a fundamental human virtue, and that it should be the aim of all societies and of all education systems to foster tolerance, to inhibit intolerance and to seek an end to the intolerable.

To be educated is, in part, to be able to make distinctions between categories including categories of people, beliefs and actions, to understand the significance of the differences, to know how to resolve conflict in a reasonable way, and to accept that in human and social terms "being different" does not mean "being worse" or "being unacceptable". Education has, also, as one of its goals, the teaching and practical demonstration of such values as fairness, justice and peaceful co-existence.

Tolerance is considered, then, to be a universal value, a defining characteristic of civilized, educated and peaceable life. Although particular types of tolerant behaviour, and the reason for them, may be relative to the civic, ethical and religious codes of different societies, and views may differ about the limits of tolerance (as they do for example regarding the limits of free speech) we should be seeking to strengthen tolerance together with other virtues such as honesty, integrity, considerateness and so on.

While practical forms of tolerant behaviour and the limits thereto will be situationally relative, there is a fundamental idea and ideal which should be actively pursued if global society is to flourish and if individuals are to develop morally and ethically as well as intellectually and spiritually and in their practical competence. Knowing what not to tolerate is part of this process and in particular depends not only on a sound and balanced set of values but the ability to discriminate and to make judgements based on facts and evidence rather than on ignorance and prejudice.

3. Learning and teaching tolerance - three key educational challenges

While tolerance has long been one of a set of universal moral values subscribed to by schooling, only relatively recently has it received special attention. This has been spurred by the challenges of increasingly plural societies, population growth, the rapid expansion of huge urban conglomerates and the growth of violence rooted in ethnic conflict, deprivation and selfish individualism. Over the last generation, there have been several distinct educational movements fostering particular moral and ethical concerns, notably education for peace, democracy, anti-racism, international understanding, multiculturalism, environmental education, and development education. Proponents have argued that these

concerns are curriculum-wide, with implications for the entire life of the school. In important ways, educating for tolerance can be seen as one of this family of movements. Indeed, taken together, and applied as cross-curricular themes of real significance, these movements can powerfully reinforce one another. Tolerance, however, has received rather less attention than these other movements. We know that there are very good reasons to foster and strengthen it, but in what ways is it distinctive - what is significant for policy makers in this new direction?

Learning and teaching tolerance pose a number of challenges for educators and their students, and we turn now to three of the most pressing. The first, is that of defining the educational task - how do we map out the relevant pedagogical and curricular tasks involved in educating for tolerance?

Four elements are proposed as learning tasks for students. First is, without becoming captive to stereotypes, to distinguish and discriminate: to learn about and recognize differences of various sorts amongst other people, be they individual (to do with temperament, personal skills and ability, or age), or be they group, community, religious, or national. This involves perception, knowledge, reflection and understanding. Second is making a critical assessment of, developing a positive interest in and valuing these differences and their appropriate expression. This involves the cognitive skills of interpretation and judgement as well as disposition.

Third is being able and willing to act tolerantly in relevant situations, while recognizing the limits to tolerance. Both disposition and practical competence are involved. Fourth is correctly judging when to be tolerant, when to regard a situation as intolerable, and choosing to act appropriately in a consistent manner. This involves the structure of personality, discrimination and conative qualities, as well as the factors mentioned in the three preceding points.

The task, then, is to enable students and teachers alike to get beneath the surface in understanding other people - to move away from stereotypes, to counter prejudice and create a fuller and more rounded view of individuals and groups in different situations. Some "cognitive dissonance" and breaking of moulds seems necessary. Thus high order teaching skills are required.

A clear distinction needs to be drawn between an educative approach leading to the goal of an intelligent commitment to certain values, and indoctrination or inculcation (literally, stamping in by the heel), by which is meant the kind of teaching which pre-empts the right of individuals to make their own informed choices of values by using teaching strategies which play down the existence of alternative views and discourage critical evaluation. This latter is not only inappropriate, but over the long term proves ineffective and counterproductive.

As we have seen, education for tolerance is part of the broader task of teaching and learning moral values and it is useful to keep this broader reference in mind, as many of the important educational issues are not unique to the specific question of tolerance. As with other moral values, tolerance is not something innate in individuals, although it is not an unreasonable assumption that most if not all young children, given the right circumstances, can become tolerant, just as they can learn the basic skills of reading, arithmetic etc. Tolerance needs to be taught, learnt and practiced, and conditions in school, home and community must be conducive to the growth of tolerance, not to inhibit or frustrate it. While values have three broad components - a rational or cognitive element, an emotional or affective element, and a volitional or dispositional element - the relationship between these in the learning process is neither direct nor automatic.

As a high order, universal polyvalent value, tolerance is a sophisticated goal towards which individuals move as they develop intellectual and moral maturity. Learning in the early years, focused on the learning of socially and culturally directed norms of personal behaviour (the equivalent to Aristotle's "habituation to goodness") is followed by a qualitatively different phase characterized by a growing sense of personal autonomy, in which individuals show a high degree of awareness, of doubts, of questioning, and a search for meaning and purpose (Singh, 1991, pp.82-3). Thus students need exposure to learning about tolerance over their entire learning career, and systematic reinforcement of that learning. Learning tolerance is a long term process and is relevant to all students and to all age groups.

A second key challenge is establishing a knowledge base for educating for tolerance. On what basis are we to proceed? Despite a number of theoretical and analytical studies, and despite the widely agreed significance of values education, the established research base on values learning is extremely, indeed dangerously, thin. This can partly be explained by the difficulty of research in this field, by the often controversial nature of the subject matter, and by the fact that there are not a large number of people who define themselves as values educators (as opposed to science, or language educators), and who therefore seek funding for, plan and undertake such research.

There is a not inconsiderable volume of research into student and teacher attitudes, but such research does not help us with questions about which values to teach, and how to do so most successfully. There are some relatively small scale studies and evaluations of innovatory teaching approaches, there is some documentation of and reflection on school practices (Taylor, 1993) and there are overviews of the major approaches to values teaching in contemporary society (Moon, 1993). But this is too shaky a base on which to claim a research foundation for policies, strategies and teaching and learning procedures. On what knowledge base, then, can we sensibly talk about directions for values education, and directions for education for tolerance? Or are we left merely in the traditional dilemma of teaching particular creeds or doctrines (inconsistent with the realities of multicultural, plural societies) or leaving everything to the preferences and interests of individual teachers, students and communities?

Although not entirely satisfactory, there is a third course we can take, when controversies abound and research evidence is thin. This is a variant of the philosophical position most strongly argued for by Karl Popper. While there may not be a large body of formally established knowledge in the sense of validated research, it is certainly true that there is some research and a not inconsiderable body of accumulated wisdom concerning the teaching of tolerance and related concerns amongst the teaching profession and those involved with educating in the informal sectors. Building on this, then, one can construct a set of propositions about teaching and learning tolerance grounded in this experience, and which it seems reasonable to accept as a provisional but nevertheless clear and firm basis of action until such time as these propositions are refuted and replaced, whether by reflective experience or hard research evidence.

A third important challenge is that identifiable obstacles and barriers exist to the learning and teaching of tolerance. A first group of barriers lies at the level of the individual -the educational challenge is to help people learn how to channel their energy into finding constructive and non-violent solutions to problems. It is in this context that belief systems have a particular importance: both religious and secular (humanist) codes and certain political ideologies have much to offer in showing individuals that there are constructive channels for fear and anxieties and that there are ideals of action against which to test action that has its roots in aggression and frustration. For schools, the importance of physical education, leisure and recreational periods and the opportunities for freely chosen

activities by students cannot be too strongly stressed. Skilful teachers can readily turn potential acts of aggression and hostility into something positive, by steering the activity, finding a substitute for the incipient battleground or even turning what could be a potentially explosive situation into a joke. Such actions provide role models and examples of ways in which intolerance and aggression can be defused and diverted into shared and positive activity.

The second group of barriers lie in the objective conditions of the environment. Where the culture of violence has an existing allure, in that it provides immediate action with relatively quick and concrete results, learning to value the idea of tolerance is not at all straightforward. This point holds for all too many schools in depressed urban areas, just as it does in the wider society where deprivation and sharp inequalities are a spur to aggression. From this perspective, non-violence is presented as being weak. It is necessary to break this nexus, and present the issue as one in which, firstly, violence is seen as the easy solution which does not really solve the problem, and secondly, a tolerant approach to resolving a difficulty can be associated with an equal intensity of feeling and firmness of action as the violent approach.

Both within the schools themselves and in the community, dissonance between the official fostering of tolerance and the personal experience of the individual student can undermine and negate the teaching. Thus, interpersonal squabbles, divided schools, and rigid hierarchical school systems can all provide situations of dissonance. Developments in the community must also support approaches taken by schools. As a race relations commissioner in Britain observed, how can we expect to succeed in teaching tolerance when black youths with the same educational qualifications as white youths continue to be discriminated against in terms of employment? Change in such objective social conditions will have a beneficial multiplier effect within the community, and make the task of schools much easier.

4. Educational Responses

Educational responses must be grounded in a vision or an ideal set of objectives relating to the strengthening of tolerant attitudes and behaviour. It is also necessary, however, to consider what is realistic and feasible for schools and other educational institutions to undertake, given the constraints of both provision of educational opportunities and the impact, often negative, of other influences. At each stage of the educational process there are issues for debate and policy decisions to be made.

a) System-wide school policies concerning tolerance

The social framework for children's daily experience of schooling has an important bearing on the quality and variety of that experience. For example, in cases of segregated school systems, students lack the opportunity to meet and personally get to know different others. Where such school systems are divided along ethnic or religious lines and reflect serious tensions within the overall national community, there is a serious problem for the learning of tolerance - a missed opportunity. This is not to say that the mere fact of an integrated school system can be sufficient - it depends very much on how it functions. Where divided schools exist - perhaps for quite good reasons - it is incumbent on educational authorities to ensure that there are opportunities for constructive interchange and shared experiences.

In many countries, tolerance is one of several values which are officially subscribed to in the overall goals of education systems (Taylor, 1993). Through international conventions and a range of legislation guaranteeing the rights of minorities, proscribing overt racism and

other forms of discrimination, the boundaries of tolerance have been legally defined and extended. The United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights stands as a landmark document in this respect. UNESCO's 1974 General Conference adoption of the Recommendation concerning Education for International Understanding, Co-operation and Peace and Education Relating to Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms has led to varied activities, including its current development of a Framework of Strategies and Integrated Action on Education for Peace, Human Rights and Democracy (UNESCO, 1994).

Important as these developments are for providing goals and directions, however, legislation by itself is insufficient, conventions are not always ratified or respected in practice, nor recommendations followed. There is a paucity of reports and research evidence on how these have been translated into practical action. Again, educational authorities need to be challenged to demonstrate that what is declared in statements of aims for the curriculum and pedagogy is followed through into practice. Some examples illustrate how relevant policies at the school system level can shape the nature of the possibilities for learning tolerance for students within schools.

Some countries have addressed this issue head on. For example, in 1961, the newly independent Malayan government established an Education Act bringing in a single national system of education with an orientation to a Malayan (later to become Malaysian) outlook for all students in its multi-ethnic, multi-cultural and multi-religious society. There had been a period of violence, and inter-racial tension was high. Moulding a united nation with an identity of its own was the new government's priority. It abolished the five pre-existing and ethnically separate education systems, and the 1961 Act introduced a common content syllabus, a common system of examinations, and the adoption of Malay, the national language, as the medium of instruction (English, the previous colonial language, but also seen an important international language, was made compulsory in all schools). Primary schools were allowed to teach in the vernacular language, and the students' own language could be taught in secondary schools as an elective if requested. Current curriculum reforms emphasize a Malaysian-centric approach - local settings and contexts seen through Malaysian eyes, and a values-across-the-curriculum approach adopted where all teachers have defined responsibilities in areas of morals, values and discipline.

A rather different approach to raising the status and educational opportunities of disadvantaged ethnic groups is illustrated by the United States. Following the landmark Brown vs Board of Education court case in the early 1950s, which ruled that schools could not be separate and equal (i.e. they could not be all white or all black), a series of rulings in court cases has further defined the extent to which states and local school districts have to overcome the effect of segregation in schools. It is incumbent on states to ensure that schools and school districts comply with these requirements, and a variety of means are used to achieve desegregation, dependent on the local circumstances. One such means is compulsory bussing, by which, in areas where the ethnic communities are effectively residentially separate, students are bussed to schools within the school district (and sometimes beyond) in such a way as to achieve an appropriate numerical representation of each community in each school. This policy has proved highly controversial but its introduction was based in the recognition that the school would be powerless unless the geographically, economically and culturally divided communities were brought together physically for at least part of the day.

Another means adopted in the USA is the development of particular kinds of magnet schools, where well resourced schools of high quality and often with particular specializations, are placed in minority areas, and, while operating a highly selective intake, are open to students from a considerable distance. Recently a parent choice approach in Minnesota has been established whereby parents in that state are no longer required to

send their children to a specific school. Federal funds are available to enable education authorities to comply with desegregation requirements. While the US desegregation approach derives from the requirement to provide equal educational provision, it also achieves one of the targets of educating for tolerance, in providing effective contact between children from different cultures.

An official policy of assimilation of migrants to the dominant Anglo-Saxon culture in Australia has, since the 1970s, been supplanted by an official social policy of multiculturalism. Since World War 2, Australia has become one of the world's most ethnically diverse nations. Educational multi-cultural policies have had two main thrusts. First has been the provision of appropriate English language education, transitional bilingual programmes, bi-cultural aspects to curricula and facilitation of home-school relationships, directly targetting immigrant and Aboriginal minorities and aiming to ensure educational equality for them. Second has been provision of 'community' language programmes for all students, adding 'multicultural perspectives' across all curricula and teaching history, Australian studies and social education generally from a pluralist perspective - trying to construct a new version of the Australian identity. In recent years, a new emphasis on the social and economic functionalism of cultural pluralism has drawn these emphases together, with children's cultural and linguistic diversity being seen as an intellectual, social and economic resource to be cultivated, rather than as a problem to be eradicated, or a right to be guaranteed.

Has Australia become a more tolerant community as a result? Opinions and research evidence are inconclusive on this point but despite occasional and relatively minor incidents, it is widely agreed that the country has enjoyed decades of harmonious relationships among ethnic communities that in their countries of origin have been or are engaged in violent conflict with one another. The Aboriginal question is of a different order: an indigenous population dispossessed of its lands and its traditional culture; but here, too, strong efforts have been made by educators to bring children towards an understanding and appreciation of a culture vastly different from that of the later settlers.

These three examples have in common the accommodation within single school systems of diverse populations, whether the communities have co-existed for a considerable period, or emerged as a result of recent migration. That is not everywhere the case, with divided school systems not uncommon, including in the communities riven by intercommunal violence and tension. Here specific means need to be found to establish contacts between groups. In Northern Ireland, for example, schools on both sides of the Protestant-Catholic divide have over a number of years established programmes working co-operatively together.

Examples of other types of system level policies are positive discrimination to bring minority groups into the teaching force, the organization of multi-age classrooms, and the practice of 'mainstreaming' or bringing into the "normal" school and classroom children with severe learning difficulties, and disabilities of various kinds. This last presents excellent opportunities for children to develop positive relationships with others whom they may never in other circumstances meet and about whom there is often fear, anxiety and a feeling of superiority.

Wagner (1992) notes that an important factor in the success of innovative programmes in schools with high levels of linguistic and cultural diversity was found to be the degree of flexibility at the school level to address situations in the local context. Thus, the degree of decentralization of the school system has an important bearing on the possibilities for education in tolerance at the individual school level. More innovative pedagogical methods

cannot be effective unless central authorities and regional academic authorities can be fairly flexible in letting schools take initiatives.

b) Pre-school, early childhood learning

At the pre-school level, role-modelling of parents, family and pre-school teachers is crucial. The question of tolerance is particularly challenging for families, as parents, while they generally have a direct experience of education, do not usually see themselves as educators except in a very informal sense. The child sees parents, relatives and friends in the totality of domestic situations, many of which are quite stressful (not least from the demands of the young themselves), and the practice of tolerance (or lack of it) form some of children's earliest impressions.

Pre-school teachers - in common with all other professional educators - generally see their students in external, more formal settings, somewhat distanced from the totality of the tensions of daily life. They may, therefore, set standards and call for behaviour that, however commendable in themselves, are at odds with the child's milieu. Teachers need a good awareness and understanding of home circumstances and of the attitudes and values of parents.

In the schooling of very young children, it is common to find a greater emphasis on developing social skills and personal qualities than on intellectual skills. The practice of the French *ecoles maternelles*, for example, is to induce and reinforce constructive and co-operative behaviour from age three onwards during the period of children's basic orientation to social life outside their immediate family. These learnings are seen as foundational for later intellectual, affective and other learnings.

Early childhood is a particularly important time for developing an orientation towards tolerance as a foundational personal trait, to be later extended and developed. When pre-schools draw on ethnically, religiously and culturally mixed neighbourhoods, there is a greater opportunity for the natural development of attitudes of acceptance of differences among children. Many urban and rural districts, however, are quite homogeneous in these respects and children do not have the vital early experience of mixing freely with others. The seeds of intolerance may thus be inadvertently sown at a very early age, simply as a result of ignorance and lack of experience. This factor underlines the roles of the home and the school - drawing upon the media of television and radio, cassettes, books, toys, outings and other experiences as well as everyday behaviour of children - in fostering respect for others and acceptance of difference. The importance of early childhood education (as opposed to childcare) for learning tolerance needs to be recognized and attention given to extending it wherever possible. Current provision of early childhood education is extremely variable worldwide.

c) School level policies, organization and management

While the degree of flexibility accorded individual schools by the system is important, studies have shown that not all schools act to use those freedoms they have. School leadership is the key here.

Policies for education for tolerance are important in two spheres. First is the <u>school curriculum</u>. Whatever the general system constraints, there are degrees of freedom at school level in terms of curriculum structuring, organization and the specific support and importance given to curriculum-wide concerns such as tolerance. While individual teachers may well take their own initiative, others may not, and may need encouragement, support and a framework for action.

Alongside the formal teaching of the school is the life of the school as a community, where the practical questions of acting tolerantly emerge as highly significant. Policies towards student discipline, linguistic variety, behaviour at school relating to cultural differences, contacts with parents and the broader community all convey important messages to both students and their families.

Where many ethnic groups are represented in the school community, specific school-wide intercultural activities have been shown to break down barriers between home and school, between the culture of origin of the home and the practical culture of the school, and, if built into the continuing life of the school, can create a climate in which parents feel not only tolerated, but welcomed into the school setting (Meyer-Bisch, 1993).

School participation in joint co-operative activities with other schools, whether neighbouring or in other countries, communicates an important resolve on the part of the school authorities. Co-operation between schools around the Baltic Sea under the auspices of UNESCO's Associated Schools Project, for example, has proved a practical way of promoting tolerance through the sharing of goals concerning culture, history and environment.

The practice of older students taking specific responsibilities for helping younger children learn has long been a traditional practice in many parts of Africa, and along with co-operative activities amongst peers, as in project work, provides an important means of learning to practice tolerance of individual differences among students in the school, irrespective of ethnic origin.

A challenging undertaking is student involvement in school governance. A.S. Neill's Summerhill stands as the boldest documented experiment in student self-governance - aimed at giving the students personal and reflective experience of active, responsible group membership. Other less all-embracing possibilities, such as student participation in a variety of school matters of direct concern to them, offer many opportunities for practical learning.

d) Curriculum-wide approaches to educating for tolerance

All teaching situations and interpersonal contacts communicate value positions of one sort or another to students. Thus, the way in which teachers approach their contact with students, organize their classrooms, and structure their teaching material can demonstrate a tolerance for difference within their classroom, as well as an intellectual tolerance of different ways in which one can understand and view a particular subject matter. Important also are the opportunities teachers see in their teaching material for students to learn about aspects of tolerance.

As children move into primary and secondary education, teaching programmes are organized predominantly according to the requirements of students' intellectual development. Especially at secondary and post-secondary level, this is narrowed further as a result of separate subject organization of curriculum and of school organization. In this setting, the specific teaching of values rarely, if ever, merits an individual slot. It is most commonly approached as a dimension of some or all of the learning programmes. Indeed, it can and often does disappear completely: everyone's responsibility becomes no-one's business.

Depending on the curriculum organization of individual schools, broad based opportunities for learning tolerance exist, through, for example, topic work in primary schools and project work in lower secondary schools where integrated activities and co-operative activities

beyond subject boundaries are not uncommon. The Commonwealth Institute in London, UNESCO's Associated Schools Project and similar multicultural education resources provide good examples of ways in which the limitations of subject based teaching can be reduced and projects undertaken to foster acceptance and respect of other cultures and ways of life.

In whatever way the school curriculum happens to be organized, widely different areas of study offer distinctive possibilities for learning tolerance, as is shown in a few selected examples. The arts (expressive, visual, dramatic, aural, oral, manual) offer myriad possibilities for learning appreciation of difference, as well as encouraging students themselves to be creative and imaginative, and explore beyond conventional barriers. There are also opportunities for practising tolerance in creative and simulated group situations, as well as coming better to understand the experience of being treated intolerantly, of belonging to a low status minority group etc. Because learning in the arts has in general a non-competitive, relatively enjoyment-oriented, albeit serious, character, it can provide a non-threatening environment for learning and exploring controversial issues.

Empathetic understanding of different people and situations is a particular feature of literary studies, which can be tied in closely to the postmodern emphasis on representation - or reinterpretation of situations through re-presenting them, drawing out new and different perspectives to get a fuller, rounder, more complex, more ambiguous understanding of situations. To avoid acting on the basis of prejudice, students need to come to understand their world as complex and subtle, not clearcut and simple.

Second language learning offers the opportunity for sustained in-depth learning about another culture group through the medium of a key element of their self-identification. As language is at the base of both concept formation and world-view, it offers a very powerful means of developing an empathetic relationship between the learner and members of another culture group, as well as its obvious utility in facilitating direct dialogue. A considerable number of countries have more than one official language; in cases such as Belgium, schooling is regionalized and schools adopt a single language, the language(s) of the other groups becoming the second (or further) language(s). In an increasingly globalized world, the learning of a second, foreign language should be a requirement for all students, not only for purposes of more extended communication, but as a way into understanding that there is a positive value in differences in the fundamental human activity of oral and written communication.

Bi-, tri- or multilingualism - full proficiency in two or more languages - is rarely achieved solely through the common pattern of beginning foreign language study in secondary schools, however. Recent years have seen many attempts to introduce second language learning into primary and pre-primary teaching - for children to begin at an age when they are known to learn other languages most easily.

A trend in science teaching whereby students focus on learning scientific methods, understanding how scientific discoveries are made and the history of the development of science, encourages students to view scientific truths as provisional rather than fixed and immutable. Questions of ethics and responsibilities in the production and use of scientific knowledge is an important and often neglected aspect of science teaching. What, for example, are the ethical implications of the use of physics for the development of weapons of mass destruction? Also, students can learn, through the history of science, as in other branches of history, of the contribution to civilization of many different cultures and individuals, through combatting one of the more insidious barriers to tolerance - ethnocentrism or nationalistic fervour. These encourage in students a receptive, enquiring

and critical orientation to knowledge and new situations they encounter. These approaches are applicable as much to the physical as to the human and social sciences.

The teaching of history is of particular importance in considering tolerance, as it has been predominantly on historical myths that the current alarming growth of ethnic nationalism has fed. The unscrupulous manipulation of history as a means to augmenting national political power has been well documented in the many tragedies of this century. The approaches of the International Baccalaureate to world history and the Council of Europe to European history, are to de-emphasize particular nationalisms and present multiple perspectives (national and other) on selected historical events. This is worthy of wider consideration for teaching at all age levels (entrenched national interests notwithstanding). Also, the range of historical events selected for study might usefully come under critical review, with specific attention given to moves to foster human rights and a tolerant world order.

Geography and social studies are the areas perhaps most closely associated with culture studies, and with learning about the different peoples of the world. In recent years a more issues- focused, action-oriented and less descriptive approach has been making headway, offering the possibility for students to gain a stronger commitment to values such as tolerance. Many schools have explicitly focused on controversial issues, moral dilemmas and values education in these areas of teaching, often linked into their local community and involving direct community contacts.

The practice of team sports can provide a strong challenge for learning tolerance - particularly if we include the spectator supporter dimension. While team sports provide experience of co-operation amongst what may be quite a diverse collection of team members, the ethics of good sportsmanship also demand that participants learn to accept losing with good grace. No such comparable ethic exists for team supporters, however, and educators would do well to address this issue with children at an early age, given the increasing incidence of individual and group violence associated with supporters of both professional and amateur sports beyond the school setting.

e) Specific courses of study

In some, but by no means all, schools and school systems, separate courses are taught which focus specifically on the development of moral values, including tolerance. Such courses, variously named, include: civics; personal and social development/ education; moral education; ethics; and religious education.

Cummings, Gopinathan and Tomoda (1988) found pronounced regional differences in the distribution of courses in moral and religious education, which they attributed to differences in political organization and ideology. When they wrote in 1988, in both communist countries and the US religious instruction in public schools was unconstitutional. Moreover, neither offered moral education as a separate explicit curriculum component, although both provided forms of moral education under headings such as civics. Islamic societies and many Western ones emphasized religion, while Asian countries and Latin American ones which lacked an established religious linkage tended to offer courses in moral education. Former British colonies emphasized religious education, and former French and Spanish ones moral education.

There is a longstanding debate in educational circles about whether religion should be taught in public schools, and if so, whether specific religious instruction and worship should be part of it. Since tolerance is a value subscribed to by a number of different religions, this question is relevant, as it provides an important context in which schools

may choose to address the teaching of tolerance. In many countries, religiously based education systems and/or independent religiously based schools exist alongside (generally) secular state education systems. National legislation concerning the teaching of religion in schools varies considerably, and obviously affects individual contexts. Hill notes that a comparison of school systems around the world shows that almost every answer that might be given to this question is being acted on somewhere at the present time (Hill, 1992, p. 48). Most efforts, he notes, assume that religion can be taught within the constraints of general education through universal schooling.

Leaving aside the merits of and different approaches that are adopted to the teaching of religion in public schools, two general points need to be raised concerning the learning of tolerance within religious studies in increasingly plural and multi-faith societies. First, one cannot deny the importance to personal and social life of the phenomena of religion and the nature of religious questions and questioning, thus an understanding of the world's major religious traditions and their history is an important part of student's general education. Second, bearing in mind the nature of religious belief and commitment, the experience for students of an empathetic engagement with at least one major world religion other than that of their own heritage offers an important avenue to their developing a closer understanding of and tolerance for those of different religious persuasions.

f) Other areas of school and community life

Beyond these areas of structured, often cognitively-based learning, schools and post-secondary establishments provide additional, more informal, opportunities for learning tolerance. Many schools have a "home room" period each day enabling students to establish informal personal relationships with a particular teacher and class group. This is a setting well suited to spontaneous discussion of current events and issues, either at school or societal level, which can focus on issues to do with tolerance. A variety of student societies exist in some institutions (especially at secondary and post secondary level) offering students of different backgrounds the opportunity of working together on activities of common interest. These include clubs or groups with a charitable or development aid purpose, clubs based on the idea of exchanging correspondence, materials and people with other countries and so on.

UNESCO's Associated Schools Project has for some 40 + years provided a framework for and lighthouse activities demonstrating a wide range of contacts between students and teachers both regionally and internationally, oriented towards promoting peace, tolerance and international understanding. The International Baccalaureate has a compulsory, but non-assessed, Creativity, Action and Service (CAS) component, in which students engage in varied community based service activities. These are all examples of opportunities for the development of tolerance.

For students who find themselves experiencing particular personal problems, such as how to come to terms with/resolve certain tensions and conflicts, the possibility of counselling should not be discounted as a means of helping their personal growth, and easing a difficult transition. Such children may demonstrate aggressive and violent behavour directed against others. Again, educational and therapeutic procedures can assist in overcoming these traits and developing acceptance of self and others.

There is a range of activities in the informal or community setting, which complement school efforts. These activities tend to have a strong experiential and practical component, and draw on voluntary effort from many parts of the community.

Providing carefully planned and managed contact among different communities is important, particularly in settings of strong community tensions. In this context it is useful to identify target communities, probably those where instances of vicious intolerance are not uncommon, and apply to them procedures drawn from research and sound practice elsewhere. Indeed, given the scale of the problem of intolerance, targeted approaches are the only ones feasible. Residential camps can bring together children from both sides of a community divide - children who otherwise might never meet. These provide commonly shared experiences as well as an opportunity for these children to meet and find out for themselves that 'x' doesn't in fact have two heads, that 'x' also likes chocolate, and so on.

Beyond the immediate areas of high inter-communal tensions, a wide range of community opportunities exists for international contacts through camps, student exchange, co-operative activities with other schools and so on. The value of such camps and exchanges has rarely been systematically evaluated, but they are widely believed to give a start towards breaking down ignorance and fostering friendships. Children's involvement with community service offers opportunities for the development of tolerance for others within their own community - such as the disabled, elderly, those with difficult family circumstances etc.

A crucial question here, is whether or not the community is behind the school's efforts to foster tolerance. If it, or definable sections of it, are not, then students will find themselves surrounded by either intolerance or indifference.

g) Post-school, adult and continuing (non formal) education

Many of the general points made in relation to schooling relate also to this level of education and do not need repetition here.

There is a lot of activity, especially in developing countries, in the areas of professional and vocational post-school education, involving companies, unions, and governments. The content of these programmes provides opportunities which have not yet been sufficiently exploited for learning tolerance. The opportunity of their expansion could be used for ensuring that a general education component, including values education is included. Giving people a chance to talk about their experiences at work, facilitating contact with migrant workers and so forth are some of the ways that learning tolerance can be approached. Adult literacy programmes are important in this respect since the expectation, especially in the highly industrialized countries that all citizens are literate (although in fact many are not) can lead to an attitude of intolerance - in terms of criticism - of those who suffer literacy problems.

h) Monitoring and assessing education for tolerance

A practical and manageable institution-level approach to monitoring education for tolerance is the curriculum audit which can be organized at a whole-institution or at a department level. Through a discussion of objectives and strategies relating to educating for tolerance, it is possible to establish the actual and potential contributions from existing activities, and to identify gaps, overlaps and progression within the provision. In this way, it is possible to decide how satisfactory is the overall nature of the institutional provision for learning about tolerance, and to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the delivery.

At present, in most educational settings, tolerance is not directly examined, and indeed, as with many personal qualities, its development is not necessarily the immediate and direct result of specific teaching, but rather a personal response to a wide range of stimuli,

often indirectly and after many years. But, bearing this in mind, it is necessary to seek some evaluation. The move in some educational settings towards greater emphasis on formative evaluations decoupled from the process of credit award offers a promising line of development. It enables teachers to gain some feedback on the interim outcomes of their teaching programmes and to formulate ways of improving and extending them. It is important, also, to consider student roles in self-assessment and the assessment of their fellow students.

But the question of credit award for students does need to addressed. Relatively well tried means already exist to establish whether students know what tolerance is in an abstract or verbal way, and how well they can reason about tolerance. Judging whether students act tolerantly or not can be established, for example, by observing verbal interactions (speech) among students, mutual acceptance by different groups of students in the school (multiculturalism), evidence of altruistic attitudes and actions showing acceptance of difference, and activities to help the needy. How to accredit this can be tricky, however, and, obviously, one needs to avoid the nonsense of linking credit award with behavioural development in such a way that students act tolerantly in certain situations in order to gain credit rather than as the result of personal conviction.

The move towards descriptive profiling of students is a promising line of development which acknowledges rather than quantifies the development of personal qualities in students. Given that the trend in a considerable number of educational systems is towards greater accreditation (and towards placing greater value on those courses which gain credit), it is reasonable that students' participation in certain courses and educational activities specifically designed to foster tolerance should have that participation appropriately acknowledged. Profiles are often, however, unduly detailed and can be highly subjective. Work is needed to produce valid and reliable statements by teachers, in simple language, that enable parents, prospective employers and educational authorities to make assessments of students' values and personal traits. There are risks - but so there are in any form of assessment and the greater risk is that by having no means of assessing and recording learning achievement in the values domain, it loses its importance in the hierarchy of school activities. Whether credit in a formal sense could be given is not only a methodological issue but one of educational principle. Clearly further work is needed on this topic.

i) Supporting teachers

Successful teaching of tolerance requires adequate preparation, support and time. It is clear that the teaching of tolerance - as of other values - is an institution-wide responsibility, relevant to all students and throughout their learning career. Achieving this, then, places demands on all teachers and administrators. What are these demands, and how are they to be met?

School leaders need to be able to foster and co-ordinate such teaching within institutions. All teachers need explicit education, training and support in the field of values education. In a situation where, as we have seen, teaching specialisms rarely, if ever, specifically relate to values education, appropriate vehicles need to be found. Distinct elements are to be noted.

First, initial teacher education and in-service education for values education currently has an uneven and patchy provision in the European domain (Taylor, 1993, p.44) and no doubt in other parts of the world as well, although some countries, such as Malaysia and Japan, are quite explicit about the need for attention to moral training in teacher education. Both pre-service and inservice education and supervision and guidance have important roles to

play everywhere. Including tolerance within a course appropriate for all teachers giving a broad approach to values learning is one way to achieve an integrated approach at school level. But one should not neglect also the value of short workshops or school projects focused on resolving specific identified problems for which tolerance is part of the answer.

Second, support and reinforcement are needed in the teaching process, helping teachers and school administrators to themselves practice tolerance in their own teaching and contacts with students (avoiding dissonance between values exhorted and values effectively practised). For example, there is an art in knowing just how much latitude to allow a class, so as to not crack down too hard and lose their willing co-operation. It is here that we find examples of intolerant behaviour on the part of teachers that may have some justification in their perception of their role and responsibilities, but can be negative in its educational effects. Helping teachers to be better class managers, to plan appropriate values learning activities for their students is important, and having access to appropriate teaching resources is important here.

Third, there is a role for education authorities in monitoring and evaluating teaching and teachers to ensure that just as cognitive learning in the conventional subjects is occurring, tolerance and associated values are being taught and practiced.

As we have seen, learning tolerance is a long term, complex process, and teaching staff need official support for their efforts from the school and wider authorities. It is also useful for teachers, preferably in small groups, to review progress from time to time. Where all teachers have an interest in and responsibility for an area of teaching, exchange of experience, co-ordination of efforts etc. are important to achieve.

5. Future Directions: policy implications

It is clear that explicit policies and programmes of education for tolerance can seek to provide individuals with a broad social, cultural and historical understanding with which to reflect on the relationships between different individuals, groups and societies. Such policies can also seek to provide students with experience of and practice in behaving tolerantly in a variety of day to day situations as well as in those designed specifically for educative purposes.

By way of summary, a number of policy implications are drawn out. Except at the level of vacuous generalities, we cannot have a single policy across the whole world for educating for tolerance. Different countries and cultures will and should approach the questions in different ways depending on their local situations, customs and beliefs. While a very generally stated aim of educating for tolerance as part of values education has some point, its interpretation and translation into specific policies and programmes will be best achieved if we acknowledge the reality of diversity of belief and custom.

While the research is not conclusive, learning for tolerance must start in the earliest years, and be continually reinforced throughout each person's education. It cannot be left to chance, to the home, to the peer group or to occasional spurts of activity in the school: consistency and persistence are required.

All teachers are teachers of tolerance, and they need support to play their part in values education. It is a responsibility of supervision whether within or outside the school to ensure that this cross-curriculum approach is followed.

The conditions for providing active learning in classrooms based on personal relationships need to be sought; the dominance in some systems of testing, frequent assessment and

examinations is more often than not a barrier to, rather than a support for, education for tolerance.

The general school framework at system level as well as at individual school level needs to support rather than hinder the learning of tolerance. Students need experience from an early age of contact (in a constructive setting) with others who are different. Flexibility of decision making at the school level is important in addressing issues of tolerance experienced in plural societies. Back-up must be provided by external authorities to enable the schools to exercise those powers to best advantage.

When schemes are introduced for learning tolerance, systematic monitoring and evaluation are needed to ensure targets are achieved, strategies adjusted etc. Policy refers to more than just drawing up proposals and getting legislation passed. It involves the identification of issues, design of programmes, strategies, implementation, monitoring, evaluation, and adjustment (a systemic perspective involving curriculum, pedagogy, teacher training and inservice education).

Is education for tolerance a government or a community responsibility? If left entirely to the government it will not be effective, and in any case, governments do not have sufficient resources. This is not to suggest that governments have no role. One of the most important responsibilities of governments, and inter-governmental bodies, is to ensure that there is a framework of aims and expectations, that appropriate monitoring procedures are in place and that resources are available to teach values, tolerance included, as much as they are for science, language, mathematics etc. There is, in tandem with this, a community-wide task, involving the voluntary sector, business, and unions amongst other agencies.

Annex

Bibliography

Adams, D. (ed) (1991) The Seville Statement on Violence - preparing the ground for the constructing of peace. Paris. UNESCO.

Batley, E., Candelier, M. Hermann-Brennecke, Szepe, G. (1993) Language Policies for the World of the Twenty-First Century. Paris. UNESCO.

Broudy, H.S., Smith, B.O., and Burnett, J.R. (1964) Democracy and Excellence in American Secondary Education - A Study in Curriculum Theory. Chicago. Rand McNally.

Classen-Bauer, I. (ed) (1989) International understanding through foreign language teaching. Bonn. German Commission for UNESCO.

Cummings, W.K., Gopinathan, S., Tomoda, Y. (eds) (1988) The Revival of Values Education in Asia and the West. Pergamon Comparative and International Education Series Vol.7. Oxford. Pergamon.

Droit, R.-P. (1993) "Les deux visages de la tolerance" in Droit, R.-P. (ed) La Tolerance Aujourd'hui - Analyses philosophiques. Paris. UNESCO.

Gandhi, M.K. (1956) The Gandhi Reader. A Source Book of His Life and Writings. ed. H.A. Jack. Bloomington. Indiana UP.

Ganguli, H.C., Mehrotra, G.P. and Mehlinger, H.D. (1981) "Values, Moral Education and Social Studies" in Mehlinger, H.D. (ed) UNESCO Handbook for the Teaching of Social Studies. Paris. UNESCO.

Hill, B. (1991) Values Education in Australian Schools. Australian Education Review No.32. Hawthorn, Vic. ACER.

Locke, J. (1948) The Second Treatise of Civil Government and A Letter Concerning Toleration. Oxford. Blackwell. [Note "Letter" composed in 1667]

Mazrui, A.A. (1972) "Educational techniques and problems of identity in plural societies" International Social Science Journal. Vol. 24 (1) pp.149-165.

Meyer-Bisch, P. (ed) (1993) Contributions du Systeme des Ecoles associees de l'UNESCO (SEA) "La culture democratique". Paris. UNESCO.

Moon, R. (1993) Humanities and Arts Education. Summary paper reporting a review of issues prepared as part of the OECD/CERI project "The Curriculum Redefined: Schooling for the 21st Century. CERI/CR (93) 4. Paris. OECD.

Morsy, Z. (1993) La Tolerance. 2nd ed. Paris. UNESCO.

Passmore, J. (1970) The Perfectibility of Man. London. Duckworth.

REDUC (Red Latinoamericana de Informacion y Documentacion en Educacion) (1993) Valores en Educacion. Paris. UNESCO. draft. mimeo.

Singh, R.R. (1991) Education for the Twenty-First Century: Asia-Pacific Perspectives. APEID. Bangkok. UNESCO Principal Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific.

Taylor, M. (1993) Values Education in Europe - A Comparative Overview of a Survey of 23 Countries in 1993. draft. London. NFER. mimeo.

UNESCO (1993a) Proclamation of the United Nations Year for Tolerance and Declaration on Tolerance. 27C/25. Paris. UNESCO.

UNESCO (1993b) Seeds for Peace - The Role of Pre-School Education in International Understanding and Education for Peace. Paris. UNESCO.

UNESCO (1993c) A Sense of Belonging - Guidelines for values for the humanistic and international dimension of education. draft. CIDREE. mimeo.

UNESCO (1994) Framework of Strategies and Integrated Action on Education for Peace, Human Rights and Democracy. Consultation in preparation for the 44th session of the International Conference on Education on the theme: "Appraisal and Perspectives of Education for International Understanding". ED/BIE/CONFINTED 44/2 Prov. Geneva. UNESCO. mimeo.

UNESCO - ACIVA (Association de Cooperation Internationale par le Volontariat Africain) (1992) Bibliographie annotee et commentee sur les valeurs dans l'education en Afrique. Paris - Dakar. UNESCO - ACIVA. draft. mimeo.

Wagner, A. (1992) "Teaching in a Multicultural Environment". OECD Observer No. 178. Oct/Nov. pp.29-31.

Williams, B. (1992) "An Awkward Virtue" UNESCO Courier June. pp.9-13.

Yovel, Y. (1993) "Tolerance as Grace and as Right" in Droit, R.-P. (ed) La Tolerance Aujourd'hui - Analyses philosophiques. Paris. UNESCO. pp.113-125.

Appendix

Selected UNESCO Activities Relating to Tolerance

Co-ordination for 1995 International Year of Tolerance

Mr. S. Lazarev, Philosophy and Ethics Division
Range of activities throughout UNESCO outlined in DG Memo 94.19 - 8 April 94.

Education Sector

1. Tolerance: The Threshold of Peace - A Teaching/Learning Guide for Peace, Human Rights and Democracy by Betty Reardon. Preliminary edition October 1994, final version anticipated early 1995.

2. Associated Schools Project for promoting international education (3,000 member institutions in 120 countries). Variety of activities fostering tolerance and associated values; specific focus on 1995 International Year. Bi-annual journal International Understanding at School. Forthcoming student and teacher publications: Democratic Culture; No to Violence; A New Partnership: Indigenous Peoples and the United Nations.

3. 44th Session of the International Conference on Education 1994, Geneva, on theme "Appraisal and Perspectives of Education for International Understanding". Tolerance to be key concern. Completion of document: Framework of Strategies and Integrated Action on Education for Peace, Human Rights and Democracy.

4. Sense of Belonging - Guidelines for values for the humanistic and international dimension of education (a European region project)

5. A set of annotated bibliographies on values education for Asia, Latin America, Africa and Europe.

C:\WPDOCS\ETUDES\S4CONNEL.ENG - 10 June 1994